| 1 | CAL J. POTTER, III, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 1988 | | |
|----|--|---|--|
| 2 | C. J. POTTER, IV, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 13225 | | |
| 3 | POTTER LAW OFFICES 1125 Shadow Lane | | |
| 4 | Las Vegas, Nevada 89102 | | |
| 5 | Ph: (702) 385-1954 Fax: (702) 385-9081 | | |
| 6 | cpotter@potterlawoffices.com cj@potterlawoffices.com | | |
| 7 | | | |
| 8 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT | | |
| 9 | DISTRICT OF NEVADA | | |
| 10 | ADAM BROOKS, | | |
| 11 | ŕ | Case No: 2:14-cv-374-GMN-GWF | |
| 12 | Plaintiff, | | |
| 13 | VS. | | |
| 14 | CITY OF HENDERSON; CHIEF JAMES WHITE, individually | | |
| 15 | and in his capacity as Interim Chief of the Henderson Police Department; | | |
| 16 | OFFICER JOSEPH W. EBERT, individually; DOES 1 through 10, | | |
| 17 | inclusive, | | |
| 18 | Defendants/ | | |
| 19 | STIPULATION AND ORDER TO EXTEND DISCOVERY | | |
| 20 | (Seco | nd Request) | |
| 21 | Pursuant to LR 6-1 and LR 26-4, the p | parties, by and through their respective counsel of | |
| 22 | record, hereby stipulate and request that this C | Court extend discovery in the above-captioned case | |
| 23 | for ninety (90) days, up to and including Tuesday, February 23, 2016. | | |
| 24 | In addition, the parties request that reb | outtal expert disclosures ¹ , dispositive motions and | |
| 25 | | | |
| 26 | | ng an extension of the expert disclosure deadline inside of the | |
| 27 | granting the instant requested extension. In evaluating | s such, the parties submit that excusable neglect exists to permit excusable neglect, the court considers the following factors: | |
| 28 | | reasonable control of the moving party, (2) whether the moving and its potential impact on the proceedings, and (4) the danger of | |
| | | | |

pretrial order be extended in accordance with the discovery extension as outlined herein. In support of this Stipulation and request, the parties state as follows:

A. DISCOVERY COMPLETED TO DATE

The Plaintiff and Defendant Officer Joseph W. Ebert have exchanged their initial disclosures.

Plaintiff has propounded Interrogatories and Requests for Production on Defendants.

Defendants have disclosed and expert witness.

B. DISCOVERY REMAINING

The following recitation of discovery to be completed is not intended to be limiting, but it is set forth to advise the Court of the current remaining discovery. The parties must conduct the following discovery:

- The outstanding written discovery must be answered.
- Party and third-party depositions.
- Expert and rebuttal expert depositions.
- Expert and rebuttal expert disclosures.
- The parties need to continue supplementing documents.

C. WHY SUCH REMAINING DISCOVERY HAS NOT BEEN COMPLETED

The parties aver, pursuant to Local Rule 6-1, that good cause exists for the requested extension. The parties agree that, pending this Court's approval, extension of remaining discovery deadlines is appropriate.

The parties have been unable to schedule depositions necessary for expert reports because of conflicting schedules and the scheduling of depositions in older cases, which were also delayed due to scheduling difficulties. However, the parties are continuing to work on discovery together without Court intervention and/or motions to compel.

prejudice to the nonmoving party. See, Pioneer Inv. Servs. Co. v. Brunswick Assocs., 507 U.S. 380, 395 S. Ct. 1489, 123 L.Ed.2d 74 (1993). Twenty-one (21) days ago the parties believed they were on track for the expert disclosure deadline. However, in order for the experts to produce meaningful reports, additional discovery must be completed, specifically depositions, which the parties were unable to set due to conflicting schedules. This extension request is made in good faith, jointly by the parties, and not for the purposes of delay. Trial in this matter has not yet been set. Moreover, since this request is a joint request, neither party will be prejudiced.

This extension request is made in good faith, jointly by the parties, to allow the parties to conduct the discovery necessary in this matter. Trial in this matter has not yet been set and dispositive motions have not yet been filed. As such, this extension will not delay this case.

Moreover, since this request is a joint request, neither party will be prejudiced. In fact, the extension will benefit the parties in allowing them to properly litigate their case.

D. CURRENT AND PROPOSED DISCOVERY DEADLINES

| Scheduled Event | Current Deadline | Proposed Deadline |
|-----------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|
| Interim Status Report | Wed., November 25, 2015 | Tuesday, February 23, 2016 |
| Disclose Experts | Wed., November 25, 2015 | Tuesday, February 23, 2016 |
| Rebuttal Experts | Monday, December 28, 2015 | Friday, March 25, 2016 |
| Discovery Cut-Off | Monday, January 25, 2016 | Friday, April 22, 2016 |
| Dispositive Motions | Wed., February 24, 2016 | Tuesday, May 24, 2016 |
| Pretrial Order | Monday, March 28, 2016 | Friday, June 24, 2016 |

This is the second request for extension of time in this matter. This request for an extension of time is not sought for any improper purpose or other purpose of delay. Rather, it is sought by the parties solely for the purpose of allowing sufficient time to conduct discovery in this case and adequately prepare their respective cases for trial. The parties respectfully submit that the reasons set forth above constitute compelling reasons for the extension.

. . .

21 ...

23 ...

25 ...

27 . .

| 1 | WHEREFORE, the parties respectfully request that this Court extend the discovery | | |
|------------------------|---|---|--|
| 2 | period as outlined in the table above. | | |
| 3 | APPROVED AS TO FORM AND CONTENT. | | |
| 4 | DATED this 25 th day of November, 2015. | DATED this 30 th day of November, 2015. | |
| 5 | POTTER LAW OFFICES | CITY OF HENDERSON | |
| 6 7 8 9 10 | By /s/ Cal J. Potter, III, Esq. CAL J. POTTER, III, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 1988 C. J. POTTER, IV. ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 13225 1125 Shadow Lane Las Vegas, NV 89102 Attorneys for Plaintiff | By /s/ Nancy D. Savage, Esq. NANCY D. SAVAGE, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 392 240 Water Street Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 Attorney for Defendant Officer Ebert | |
| 12 | | | |
| 13 | | | |
| 14 | | <u>ORDER</u> | |
| 15 | IT IS SO ORDERED. | | |
| 16 | December 1, 2015 | Leonge Foley of | |
| 17 | DATED | GEÖRGE FOLEY, R. United States Magistrate Judge | |
| 18 | | | |
| 19 | | | |
| 20 | | | |
| 21 | | | |
| 22 | | | |
| 23 | | | |
| 24 | | | |
| 25 | | | |
| 26 | | | |
| 27 | | | |
| 28 | | | |